



Multivariate Behavioral Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/hmbr20>

Dimensions Of Social Stratification For Whites And Blacks

Lawrence J. Stricker

Published online: 10 Jun 2010.

To cite this article: Lawrence J. Stricker (1982) Dimensions Of Social Stratification For Whites And Blacks, Multivariate Behavioral Research, 17:2, 139-167, DOI:

[10.1207/s15327906mbr1702_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr1702_1)

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr1702_1

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION FOR WHITES AND BLACKS

LAWRENCE J. STRICKER
Educational Testing Service

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine the major dimensions of social stratification for whites as well as blacks. A survey was conducted with household heads in the Toledo, Ohio area of both races, using an interview that covered a comprehensive set of potentially important variables. Eighteen first-order factors were found for whites and 19 for blacks. Five factors matched in the two samples: social status, residence, organization activity, political activity and efficacy, and main support's social status. Other important factors, unique to each sample, were: for whites, self-employed and majority group membership, and for blacks, class consciousness and method variance. Second- and third-order factors were also obtained, but they were difficult to interpret. The findings indicate that stratification is more complex than anticipated by current conceptualizations and previous research.

Social stratification has been an extraordinarily active area, both theoretically and empirically, since the 1930's. Despite this activity, however, some fundamental questions still remain unanswered. One concerns the dimensionality of stratification. Many conceptualizations of the underlying dimensions have been advanced. Univariante views include, among others, economic position (Marx, 1967; Marx and Engels, 1932), class consciousness (Centers, 1949), and social status (Warner and Lunt, 1941; Warner, Meeker, and Eells, 1949). And multivariate schemes range from sustenance and comfort, self-respect and ego expansion, and humor and diversion (Davis and Moore, 1945; Moore, 1963), to economic position, status, and power (Weber, 1946, 1947). Empirically, though, this field has focused predominantly on status, largely

This study was supported in part by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under Research Grant 1 PO1 HD 01762. Portions of this investigation were presented at the meetings of the Society of Multivariate Experimental Psychology, State College, Pennsylvania, November, 1976.

Thanks are due Elton F. Jackson for advice about all stages of the study; Reuben Cohen for devising the sampling plan and supervising the entire field work; Darla Felsburg and Charlotte Slider for carrying out the sampling as well as supervising the interviewing; Karla Shepard Goldman for assistance in preparing the editing and coding manuals; Edward C. Nystrom for supervising the editing and coding; Henrietta Gallagher, Kathryn M. Kazarow, and Brian McNally for carrying out the data analysis; John L. Barone, Richard H. Harrison, Diane Pasta, and Keith Soper for computer programming; and Harry H. Harman and Ledyard R. Tucker for advice about the factor analysis.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Lawrence J. Stricker, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08541.

neglecting the other postulated dimensions. Concern with status is seen in most research efforts, such as Warner's (Warner and Low, 1947; Warner and Lunt, 1941, 1942; Warner and Srole, 1945) classic study of Yankee City, as well as in the majority of commonly used indexes of stratification, many of which grew out of these investigations (Gordon, 1958).

Several factor analyses (Artz, Curtis, Fairbank, and Jackson, 1971; Atherton, 1962; Kahl and Davis, 1955; Knupfer, 1946) are consistent with a multidimensional conception of stratification, even though these studies were limited to existing indexes and other variables predominantly reflecting social status, thereby restricting the scope of the factors obtained. Although all the investigations, except the Knupfer study in which the pertinent data are unreported, found a large general factor (prior to rotation), one or more other factors were also identified. Atherton, Kahl and Davis, and Knupfer found two; and Artz et al., analyzing six communities, uncovered five in each. Two factors were found in all four studies: (a) one defined by the respondent's occupation as well as education, and, sometimes, friends' occupation; and (b) another by variables concerning his or her home and neighborhood and, occasionally, family income. Artz et al. found several additional factors, one defined by family income, another by the occupation and education of the respondent's parents, a third by his father-in-law's occupation and wife's education, and a fourth by majority group membership (essentially white vs. black and Chicano). These investigators also identified two second-order factors, which differed in composition from community to community.

A related issue is whether the dimensions of stratification are the same for whites and blacks. The conceptualizations are based on, if not limited to, white societies, and most of the pertinent research has been done with whites. Very little in the way of theoretical speculation and empirical data exists on this precise point. It has long been contended, though, that each race has its own social structure (Park, 1928; Warner, 1936). And it is noteworthy that standard indexes of stratification generally differ in their intercorrelations for whites and blacks, the relationships typically being higher for the former (Anderson, 1955; Blum, 1972; Coleman, Blum, Sorenson, and Rossi, 1972; Duncan, 1969; Goyder and Pineo, 1974; Jackman and Jackman, 1973; Turner, 1953).

The principal aim of the present study was to determine the major dimensions of social stratification for whites and blacks in

a large Northern city by factor analyses of a comprehensive set of potentially important variables drawn from the relevant theoretical and empirical literature. The focus was on a large city because of the importance of communities of this size and on a Northern one because the effects on blacks of segregation and discrimination may be less severe in that section of the country. Secondary goals were (a) to assess the correspondence between these dimensions and leading conceptualizations of stratification and (b) to compare the dimensions for the two races. An additional purpose was to identify the best measure of each dimension; this topic is taken up in a separate publication (Stricker, 1980).

METHOD¹

Sampling Procedure

The field work, by Opinion Research Corporation, was carried out during 1967-1968 in Lucas County, Ohio, which represented the Toledo Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) at the time of the 1960 Census. (The Toledo SMSA was subsequently enlarged in 1963 to include Wood County, Ohio, and Monroe County, Michigan, U. S. Bureau of the Budget, 1964.) This community was chosen because it seemed to be reasonably representative of large Northern cities. The 1960 definition of the Toledo SMSA as comprising only Lucas County was adopted primarily because the field work could be more readily carried out in a single county, particularly in view of the relatively small samples required.

The Toledo SMSA consists of the city, several suburban communities, and rural areas (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962). The SMSA population (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962, Table P-1; 1972, Table P-1) was 456,931 in 1960, including 318,003 in Toledo, and 484,370 in 1970, with 383,818 in the city. The percentage of blacks in the SMSA and in the city was 9.4% and 12.6%, respectively, in 1960, and 11.3% and 13.8% in 1970.

Separate multistage area probability samples were drawn of white and black households. Interviews were conducted with heads of households, whether they were male or female. Interviewers

1. A detailed description of the sampling and other phases of the field work, questionnaire, editing and coding of the data, and selection of variables for the statistical analysis appears in Stricker (1976). A full account of the derivation of new variables from the variables obtained from the questionnaire and other sources is available from the author.

were assigned to respondents of the same race. The white sample consisted of 282 homes, and interviews were completed with 225 (79.8%) of them; the black sample had 260 homes, and interviews were completed with 206 (79.2%). The completion rates did not differ in either sample for homes classified as "excellent," "very good," and "good" dwellings; "average" dwellings; and "fair," "poor," and "very poor" dwellings on the basis of ratings on Warner et al.'s (1949) house type scale that were made during an initial listing of the homes ($\chi^2[2] = 3.86, p > .05$, two-tailed, for whites; $\chi^2 = 2.24, p > .05$, two-tailed, for blacks).

The samples were substantially different: whites being older; comprising more males, married people, and heads of simple nuclear families; and possessing higher social status and wealth. The median years of age was 52.5 for whites and 43.4 for blacks. In both samples, the majority was male (82.2% of whites and 65.5% of blacks); most were married (76.4% of whites and 56.9% of blacks); the most common household type was a husband and wife with children and no other relatives or nonrelatives (46.4% of whites and 33.7% of blacks); and the median number of persons in the home was 3. The median family income was \$8,708 for whites and \$4,958 for blacks; and the most common current occupation for whites was retired (17.2%), followed by managers, officials, and proprietors (15.3%); and for blacks was operatives and kindred workers (21.9%), followed by retired (14.6%). The median years of education was 11.8 for whites and 9.7 for blacks, and the median interviewer's rating of social class was "upper lower class" in both samples.

The available data for both samples were roughly similar to the corresponding statistics on households and their heads reported for Lucas County in the 1960 and 1970 censuses, the most striking divergence being that the white sample owned somewhat more homes. (The percentage of owner occupied homes was 82.0% in the sample, 72.5% in the 1960 census, and 70.7% in the 1970 census, U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962, Table H-1; 1971, Tables 14 and 17—Lucas County.)

Questionnaire

A highly structured questionnaire was developed to assess variables that fall roughly into four categories:

a. Those that directly reflected major theoretical dimensions of social stratification. In order to restrict coverage to manageable

proportions, dimensions stemming from the conceptions of Weber (1946, 1947), Warner (Warner and Lunt, 1941; Warner et al., 1949), and Centers (1949) were emphasized due to their special relevance. Dimensions associated with other theories, especially those of Marx (Marx, 1967; Marx and Engels, 1932) and Davis and Moore (Davis and Moore, 1945; Moore, 1963), were also considered to some extent. Several aspects of Weber's economic component were minimally represented by variables because of inherent difficulty in operationalizing the conception. In addition, only a sample was included of the large number of variables tapping life chances, associated with Weber's economic dimension, and life styles, linked with his social status dimension.

b. Those that represented explicit indexes of stratification. They included all the commonly used measures, whether standardized or ad hoc, as well as other variables that were found to be important in previous factor analyses.

c. Those that tapped well established correlates of stratification. In view of the vast array of pertinent variables, it was only possible to include a few from each of a variety of areas.

d. Those that concerned relevant controls and descriptive characteristics of the respondent (e.g., social desirability response style, household type).

Other Data Sources

Variables were also secured from other sources of data: area and home ratings made by listers (often, though not always, of the same race as the respondents) during the sampling process, characteristics of the interview and interviewer reported in field records, and census tract statistics from the 1960 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962, Tables H-1 and H-2).

Editing and Coding

Codes for the variables from the questionnaire and other sources were adapted wherever feasible from those used in previous research. Each variable was edited and coded independently by two people, and any disagreements were reconciled by a third. Those doing this work were blind to the respondents' race and standing on the basic dimensions of social stratification (social status, economic position, power, and class consciousness), the pertinent questions and ratings on the questionnaires having been deleted from it and processed separately. The final set of reconciled

scores were edited by computer to eliminate those that (a) were inconsistent with related variables on the basis of editing and coding rules or on logical grounds or (b) represented nonexistent values for a variable.

Derivation of New Variables

New variables, also modeled after those employed previously, were developed from the coded ones. Many of the new variables were based on (a) small factor analyses to combine variables into scales and (b) inspections of frequency distributions to choose variables with high endorsement frequencies, construct indexes, and determine appropriate codes. These analyses were carried out separately for the two samples; the emphasis throughout was on identifying or deriving variables that functioned similarly in both.

Selection of Variables

Two broad groups of variables were selected from a larger preliminary set for use in the factor analyses: (a) 59 in the basic analysis—representing major theoretical dimensions as well as indexes of social stratification; and (b) 85 in the supplementary analysis—primarily reflecting correlates of stratification and control variables, but including a few that were applicable only to one race as well as some that tapped major dimensions or were indexes and either had marginal psychometric characteristics or were algebraically or experimentally dependent on others in the basic analysis. The supplementary analysis was designed to estimate indirectly the composition of the 85 variables in terms of the factors identified in the basic analysis. It was not feasible to include the basic and supplementary variables in the same analysis, mainly because of their large number and heterogeneity, but also because of the dependence between the two sets of variables.

All the variables were selected for their theoretical and empirical relevance. In addition, the selection of variables for the best analysis was guided by considerations about psychometric characteristics (number of respondents with usable scores, discrepancies in computer editing, intercoder reliability, internal-consistency reliability) and algebraic and experimental dependence, the focus being on identifying for possible rejection variables that were inadequate in both samples. The final choice weighed these issues along with the variables' potential importance.

The basic variables appear in Table 1 and the supplementary variables in Table 2.

Table 1
Basic Variables

Variable
Social Status
Self-report of comparative social standing
Interviewer's rating of social class
Own occupation—Duncan (1961a, 1961b) scaling
Own education—years
Interviewer's rating of intelligence
Protestant religious preference
Sex is male
Age—years
Main support's occupation—Duncan (1961a, 1961b) scaling
Main support's education—years
Friend's occupation—Duncan (1961a, 1961b) scaling
Wealth
Self-report of comparative income and wealth
Source of Income
Own income—in 1000's
Family savings
Family debts
Power
Self-report of comparative influence and power
Decision maker in community affairs
Takes active part in local issues
People ask for his/her opinions
Thinks public officials care about him/her
Number of officials or politicians he/she has met
Had contact with officials or politicians about something he/she wanted
Number of organization memberships
Number of leadership positions in organizations
Number of organizations that take stands on public issues
Own occupation—Centers' (1949) power
Number of employees supervised
Class Consciousness
Centers' (1949) Class Identification measure
Thinks of self as being in a social class
Believes there are two or more classes
Says workers like unions, and businessmen do not
Belongs to a union
Republican political party preference
Psychological Gratification
Happiness
Extent of success in life
Current or last job: Satisfaction

Table 1 (Continued)

Variable
Home and Possessions
Possessions
Number of newspapers
Number of magazines
Food expenditures
Housing expenditures
Rent—actual or estimated
Persons per room
Owner vs. renter of home
Interviewer's rating of house type
Self-report of comparative neighborhood quality
Interviewer's rating of dwelling area
Census: Median house value for census tract (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962)
Census: Median rent for census tract (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962)
Census: Percent deteriorating and dilapidated housing for census tract (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962)
Life Chances and Life Styles
Number of times unemployed
Number of spare time activities
Interviewer's rating of grammar
Attitudes and Values
Anomie
Authoritarianism
Congenial vs. economic considerations in choosing a job
Personal vs. impersonal factors in getting ahead on a job
Personal vs. impersonal things affecting success

Table 2
Supplementary Variables

Variable
Social Status
Own nationality—Lenski (1954) scaling
Own nationality—Rossi (Note 1) scaling
Race is black
Interviewer's rating of skin color
Main support's nationality—Rossi (Note 1) scaling
Wealth
Other family members' income—in 1000's
(Own or family income—in 1000's)
Power
(Number of successful contacts with officials or politicians)
(Number of all contacts with officials or politicians)
Class Consciousness
Centers' (1949) Conservatism-Radicalism scale—revised

Table 2 (Continued)

Variable
Home and Possessions
Chapin's (1935) Social Status scale—original weights
Chapin's (1935) Social Status scale—Guttman (1942) weights
(Rent—actual or estimated—per room)
(Number of rooms)
(Lister's rating of house type)
Interviewer's rating of building type—private home
Interviewer's rating of building condition
(Lister's rating of dwelling area)
Neighbor's occupation—Duncan (1961a, 1961b) scaling
Composite Indexes
(Hollingshead's, 1957, Two Factor Index of Social Position)
(Warner et al.'s, 1949, Index of Status Characteristics)
Background and Family Situation
Raised in broken home
Main support was man
Main support's birthplace
Number of all siblings
Own birthplace
Size of community where raised
Length of time in Toledo
Marital status—married
Spouse had income
Broken family
Extended family
Nonrelatives in home
(Number in nuclear family in home)
(Number in total family in home)
(Number of persons in home)
Child Rearing
Physically punishes child
Permits child's aggression towards parent
Buying Behavior
Buys on installment plan
Life insurance policy size
Leisure Time Activities
(Spare time activities: Radio and television)
(Spare time activities: Active sports and recreation)
Activities in past week: Went to a bar
Activities in past week: Worked on car
Activities in past week: Read Bible
Activities in past week: Sang or played instrument
Number of visits with friends
Attendance at organization meetings
Number of favorite television programs
Type of favorite television programs: Comedy
Type of favorite television programs: Current affairs and news
Type of favorite television programs: Movies
Type of favorite television programs: Sports

Table 2 (Continued)

Variable
Occupationally Related Issues
First job—Duncan (1961a, 1961b) scaling
Age at first job
Number of jobs held
Currently employed full time
Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else
Current or last job: Length of time employed
Current or last job: Chances of advancement
Current or last job: Extent of skill and talent used
Aspirations
Preferred job for self—Duncan (1961a, 1961b) scaling
Educational aspiration for self—years
Occupational aspiration for son—Duncan (1961a, 1961b) scaling
Educational aspiration for son—years
Expected changes in future income
Mobility and Inconsistency in Status
(Blau and Duncan's, 1967, Intrageneration Occupational Mobility score)
(Blau and Duncan's, 1967, Intergeneration Occupational Mobility score)
(Intergeneration educational mobility)
Intrageneration income mobility
(Lenski's, 1954, Index of Status Crystallization)
(Laumann's, 1966, Index of Associational Status Congruence)
Impulse Expression
Present vs. future orientation
Chooses immediate vs. delayed gratification in spending windfall
Politics and Religion
Voting frequency in elections
Religious interest
Interview and Interviewer
Date of interview
Length of interview
Interview reassigned
Interview validated
Interviewer: Sex is male
Interviewer: Age
Interviewer: Education
Interviewer's rating of frankness
Marlowe-Crowne (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) Social Desirability scale—revised

Note. Variables that are algebraically or experimentally dependent on basic variables are shown in parentheses.

Statistical Analysis

The factor analyses were carried out separately for the white and black samples. Product-moment correlations were computed between the entire set of basic and supplementary variables, the number of respondents on which each correlation was based vary-

ing because of missing data. A first-order factor analysis, using the principal axis method, was carried out on the 59 x 59 correlation matrix for the basic variables. The number of factors was determined by two joint criteria: (a) the latent roots greater than one in an initial factor analysis, employing unity as the diagonal value for each variable; and (b) discontinuities in the distribution of roots in another preliminary factor analysis, using as the diagonal value for each variable its squared multiple correlation with the others. The factor analysis was completed with iterated communalities, using the squared multiple correlations as initial estimates. In the event that the criteria for the number of factors disagreed, the factor analysis was completed for both solutions and the one chosen in which the standard deviation of its residual correlations was closest to that for a population correlation of zero (McNemar, 1942). Factors were rotated to oblique structure by the promax procedure (Hendrickson and White, 1964), using powers of 2 and 4. The rotation was selected that yielded the highest hyperplane count—the number of loadings (i.e., correlations with reference vectors) of less than .10 (Cattell, 1952). Loadings of the supplementary variables on the factors were estimated by extension methods (Dwyer, 1937).

A second-order factor analysis was conducted with the correlation matrix for the rotated factors obtained at the first-order level, using the same procedures employed in that analysis. And, in turn, a third-order analysis was carried out with the second-order factors, again employing the same procedures. The loadings of the basic and supplementary variables on the second- and third-order factors were estimated by the Cattell-White procedure (Cattell, 1965).

The correspondence between the first-order factors in the two samples was evaluated from the loadings of the basic variables, using the coefficient of congruence and visual inspection.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION²

First-Order Factors

Eighteen first-order factors were identified for the white

2. Tables containing the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the basic and supplementary variables in each sample, unrotated factor and transformation matrices for the two, and coefficients of congruence between their rotated factors are available from the author. Tables containing the second- and third-order rotated factor matrices for the two samples as well as the estimated loadings of the basic and supplementary variables on these factors appear in Stricker (1976).

Lawrence J. Stricker

sample and 19 for the black. These factors, after iteration, accounted for 53.8% of the total variance for whites and 54.4% for blacks. The percentage of variance associated with each factor ranged, for whites from 18.9% for Factor I to .9% for Factor XVIII; for blacks from 13.4% for Factor I to .9% for Factor XIX.

The correlations between the rotated factors in each sample are shown in Table 3. The correlations were generally moderate, ranging for whites from .67 to -.40 with a median absolute

Table 3
Intercorrelations of Obliquely Rotated First-Order Factors

	Factor																		
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	
I Residence		.67	.48	.35	.33	.44	.28	.16	.46	-.27	.41	.47	.20	.41	.33	.06	-.01	.09	
II Social Status	.12		.46	.25	.35	.25	.21	.08	.36	-.28	.23	.39	.15	.28	.38	.10	.02	.07	
III Residence	.43	.19		.38	.07	.25	.38	.10	.14	-.29	.27	.30	.16	.16	.10	.18	.08	-.01	
IV Method	.17	-.01	.03		.07	.10	.17	.12	.12	-.33	.33	.23	.17	.18	.10	.20	.14	-.02	
V Household Size	.13	.19	.22	-.07		.46	.21	.00	.27	-.12	.30	.12	.36	.27	.20	-.18	-.23	.35	
VI Organization Activity	.18	.24	.16	.19	-.06		.12	.15	.38	-.04	.38	.19	.12	.26	.17	-.10	-.10	.17	
VII Nature of Income	.34	.07	.23	.34	.15	.31		-.05	.15	-.25	.19	.18	.54	.30	-.02	-.14	.07	.21	
VIII Political Activity and Efficacy	.33	.24	.28	.25	.26	.31	.31		.13	.10	.18	.19	-.10	.08	-.06	.27	.09	.02	
IX Amount of Housing	.30	.08	.26	.15	.12	.17	.33	.18		-.27	.17	.16	.14	.24	.39	-.20	.01	.15	
X Main Support's Social Status	.25	.31	.48	.24	.27	.21	.35	.39	.06		-.13	-.16	-.20	-.12	-.32	.06	-.27	.01	
XI Power	.11	.22	.08	.11	.01	.04	.15	.15	.02	.20		.07	.20	.07	.11	.12	.02	.10	
XII Conservative Ideology	.00	-.39	-.18	.20	-.55	.04	.04	-.13	.02	-.26	-.07		.18	.52	.11	.17	.15	-.10	
XIII Leadership	.11	.00	.10	.14	-.03	.28	.31	.17	.22	.18	.06	.30		.28	-.01	-.20	.11	.85	
XIV Occupational Orientation	-.06	.16	.11	.21	-.12	.00	.02	-.03	-.08	.22	.10	-.10	-.14		.10	-.04	-.17	.22	
XV Class Consciousness	.28	.20	.24	.03	.42	-.01	.41	.38	.11	.31	.21	-.38	-.11	.16		.10	-.08	.03	
XVI Uninterpretable	-.16	.31	.07	-.14	.18	-.07	-.21	-.17	-.07	.06	-.03	-.39	-.30	.14	-.06		-.03	-.18	
XVII Uninterpretable	.25	.26	.17	.21	.17	.31	.28	.38	.23	.27	.20	-.03	.21	-.16	.13	-.08		-.40	
XVIII Uninterpretable	.32	.04	.25	.29	.23	.13	.53	.30	.21	.34	.02	.03	.27	.02	.36	-.27	.14		
XIX Uninterpretable	.07	.06	.03	-.09	.46	.04	.18	.19	.12	.08	.04	-.28	-.13	-.27	.30	.08	.30	.09	

Note. The intercorrelations of the white factors appear above the diagonal and those for the black factors below it.

correlation of .17, and for blacks from .53 to $-.55$ with a median of .18.

Thirteen white and 15 black factors were interpretable from the loadings for both the basic and supplementary variables. Five white and six black factors matched (one white factor corresponded to two black factors). The matches involved the six highest coefficients of congruence, ranging from .58 to .73, and all the factors were interpretable ones.

The salient loadings ($>.30$) of the basic and supplementary variables on the interpretable factors are listed below. In the case of variables that had salient loadings on a matching factor in only one sample, the smaller loadings in the other sample are given, in italics, too. In these listings, the basic variables appear before the supplementary ones, and any of the latter that were dependent on the former are shown in parentheses. The five matching factors are presented first, followed by the others—eight for whites and nine for blacks.

Matching white and black factors.

Matching: White I, Black II (Social Status)

	White I	Black II
Interviewer's rating of grammar	.55	.65
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	.49	.57
Interviewer's rating of social class	.37	.32
Own education—years	.35	.43
Friend's occupation—Duncan scaling	.46	.03
Own occupation—Duncan scaling	.44	.17
(Intergeneration educational mobility)	.34	.33
(Blau and Duncan's Intergeneration Occupational Mobility score)	.42	.15
Interviewer's rating of frankness	.06	.42
(Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position)	.41	.13
Preferred job for self—Duncan scaling	.40	.19
Educational aspirations for self—years	.18	.30

This relatively broad matching factor, defined by variables derived from interviewers' ratings as well as respondents' reports, obviously represents social status. Interestingly, this factor was not loaded by variables based on respondents' direct reports of their social status—Self-report of Comparative Social Standing or Centers' (1949) Class Identification measure. A striking difference between the samples is that Own Occupation and Friend's Occupa-

tion did not appear on this factor for blacks, although consistent with previous results, they did for whites. This matching factor is very similar to one found in all the previous investigations.

Matching: White II, Black I and III (Residence)

	White	Black	
	II	I	III
Interviewer's rating of dwelling area	.61	.69	.04
Self-report of comparative neighborhood quality	.59	.63	-.01
Census: Median house value for census tract	.52	-.03	.82
Census: Median rent for census tract	.45	.05	.48
Interviewer's rating of house type	.35	.67	-.05
Census: Percent deteriorating and dilapidated housing for census tract	-.40	.02	-.64
Interviewer's rating of social class	.12	.36	.02
(Lister's rating of dwelling area)	.44	.47	.05
(Lister's rating of house type)	.39	.45	.07
(Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics)	.13	.64	-.04
Interviewer's rating of building condition	.16	.45	-.07
Chapin's Social Status scale—original weights	.34	.03	.10
Neighbor's occupation—Duncan scaling	.31	.05	.11

This matching factor clearly involves residence. It is especially interesting that the single factor for whites, encompassing every source of variables in this study—interviewers' and listers' ratings, respondents' reports, and census information, splits into two for blacks, one for the ratings and reports, the other for the census data. The pair correlated .43. This matching factor is highly similar to one identified in all the earlier studies.

Matching: White IV, Black VI (Organization Activity)

	White	Black
	IV	VI
Number of organization memberships	.67	.70
Number of organizations that take stands on public issues	.55	.61
Number of leadership positions in organizations	.59	.23
Family savings	-.05	.32
Attendance at organization meetings	.47	.36
Date of interview	-.09	.34
Chapin's Social Status scale—original weights	.08	.34
(Spare time activities: Active sports and recreation)	-.09	.31

This relatively specific matching factor taps organization activity.

Matching: White VIII, Black VIII (Political Activity and Efficacy)

	White VIII	Black VIII
Takes active part in local issues	.70	.72
Had contact with officials or politicians about something he/she wanted	.46	.30
People ask for his/her opinions	.29	.38
Decision maker in community affairs	.09	.30
(Number of all contacts with officials or politicians)	.61	.41
(Number of successful contacts with officials or politicians)	.33	.26
Chapin's Social Status scale—Guttman weights	-.31	.09

This matching factor seems to be an amalgam of political activity and efficacy. The white version of this factor is narrower than the black one, encompassing only activity. Political efficacy for whites is represented by another factor (XI) that did not correlate ($r = .18$) with the present factor's white form or match (coefficient = .34) this factor's black counterpart. It is also noteworthy that Self-report of Comparative Influence and Power did not load this matching factor.

Matching: White XII, Black X (Main Support's Social Status)

	White XII	Black X
Main support's education—years	.53	.73
Main support's occupation—Duncan scaling	.52	.45
(Blau and Duncan's Intergeneration Occupational Mobility score)	-.66	-.52
(Intergeneration educational mobility)	-.73	-.69
Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale—revised	.04	.33

This matching factor clearly reflects the social status of the respondent's main support (i.e., father, mother, or surrogate) during childhood. Contrary to the situation involving the matching factor for respondent's social status, the pertinent occupation variable—Main Support's Occupation—defined the present factor for blacks as well as whites. A highly similar factor was found by Artz et al. (1971).

Factor III seems to involve the intactness of the family, rather than sex, per se. Sex is Male indirectly reflects intactness because of the designation of men as respondents in households where both

Lawrence J. Stricker

Other white factors.

Factor III (Intactness of Family)

Sex is male	.65
Persons per room	.46
Self-report of comparative income and wealth	.37
Possessions	.34
Own income—in 1,000's	.32

Marital status—married	.74
Currently employed full time	.52
(Number in nuclear family in home)	.46
(Number in total family in home)	.46
(Number of persons in home)	.45
(Family income—in 1,000's)	.37
Intrageneration income mobility	.33
Current or last job: Length of time employed	.32
Activities in past week: Worked on car	.32
Broken family	-.31
Age at first job	-.36
Chapin's Social Status scale—original weights	-.39

a husband and wife were present. This intactness interpretation is also supported by the loadings for Marital Status and Broken Family. It is noteworthy that several key income variables—Self-report of Comparative Income and Wealth, Own Income, and Family Income—appeared on this factor, although their loadings were relatively low.

Factor V (Age)

Age—years	.56
Family savings	.54
Owner vs. renter of home	.37

Current or last job: Length of time employed	.53
Length of time in Toledo	.36
Voting frequency in elections	.31
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale—revised	.31
Intrageneration income mobility	-.30
Expected changes in future income	-.33

This factor appears to be age, in view of the defining loading for Age and the loadings for other age related variables—Current or Last Job: Length of Time Employed and Length of Time in Toledo.

Factor VI (Occupational Success)

Extent of success in life	.54
Self-report of comparative social standing	.32
Number of times unemployed	-.49
Current or last job: Chances of advancement	.34
Number of jobs held	-.37

Factor VI obviously taps occupational success.

Factor VII (Household Expenses)

Family debts	.58
Housing expenditures	.42
Food expenditures	.35
Broken family	.35
(Number of rooms in home)	.32
Chapin's Social Status scale—Guttman weights	-.43
Chapin's Social Status scale—original weights	-.49

This factor seems to involve household expenses. An alternative interpretation as a level of living factor is inconsistent with the negative loadings for Chapin's (1935) Social Status scale (original and Guttman, 1942, weights), which should reflect this characteristic.

Factor IX (Self-Employed)

Own occupation—Centers' power	.51
Personal vs. impersonal factors in getting ahead on a job	.40
Source of income	.34
Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	.54
Chapin's Social Status scale—Guttman weights	.40

Factor IX represents being self-employed, a characteristic shared by three disparate variables loading this factor: Own Occupation—Centers' power, Source of Income, and Current or Last Job: Self-employed vs. Works for Someone Else.

Lawrence J. Stricker

Factor X (Majority Group Membership)

Protestant religious preference	.62
Republican political party preference	.41
Congenial vs. economic considerations in choosing a job	.35

Own nationality—Lenski scaling	.31
(Spare time activities: Active sports and recreation)	-.34
Chapin's Social Status scale—original weights	-.43

This factor seems to be majority group membership, judging from the loadings for Protestant Religious Preference, Republican Political Party Preference, and Own Nationality (Lenski, 1954, scaling). (Another version of the latter variable, based on Rossi, Note 1, scaling, did not appear on the factor.) An alternative interpretation of Factor X as conservatism is inconsistent with the absence of Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale. A majority group membership factor, defined by a race or ethnic group variable, was found by Artz et al.

Factor XI (Political Efficacy)

Thinks public officials care about him/her	.51
Decision maker in community affairs	.33
Says workers like unions, and businessmen do not	-.34

(Number of all contacts with officials or politicians)	.33
Chapin's Social Status scale—Guttman weights	-.41

Factor XI taps political efficacy.

Factor XV (Alienation)

Anomie	.52
Number of spare time activities	.37

(Spare time activities: Radio and television)	.31
Chapin's Social Status scale—original weights	-.46

This factor seems to reflect alienation.

Other black factors.

Factor IV (Method)

Self-report of comparative social standing	.71
Self-report of comparative influence and power	.62
Self-report of comparative income and wealth	.38

[None]

Factor IV, consisting solely of self-reports concerning the three Weberian dimensions and the only black factor loaded by these variables, may represent method variance, perhaps stemming from a consistent bias in self-regard. The possibility that Factor IV simply reflects intentional distortion is ruled out by the absence of any loading for the Marlowe-Crowne (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) Social Desirability scale. This factor can also be viewed substantively as a global dimension of stratification, but the ubiquity of method factors, even in the absence of a white one in this study, suggests that the first interpretation is more apt to be correct.

Factor V (Household Size)

Persons per room	.74
Food expenditures	.64
(Number of persons in home)	.86
(Number in total family in home)	.85
(Number in nuclear family in home)	.82
Chapin's Social Status scale—Guttman weights	-.34

This factor appears to reflect household size, rather than crowdedness, judging from the substantial loading for Food Expenditures as well as the lower loading for Persons per Room than Number of Persons in Home (used in deriving Persons per Room) and two other size variables—Number in Total Family in Home and Number in Nuclear Family in Home.

Factor VII (Nature of Income)

Source of income	.75
Own income—in 1,000's	.33
Thinks public officials care about him/her	-.31
Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	.33
Current or last job: Length of time employed	.32
Broken family	-.35

Factor VII involves the nature of the respondent's income, mainly whether it is salary, commissions, and wages; or welfare, unemployment compensation, and illegal income—the two major

Lawrence J. Stricker

categories for Source of Income in this sample (121 of the 150 reporting were in the former and 22 in the latter).

Factor IX (Amount of Housing)

Rent—actual or estimated	.69
Owner vs. renter of home	.56
Housing expenditures	.39
(Number of rooms)	.50
Interviewer's rating of building type—private home	.37

This factor seems to tap amount of housing, rather than its quality, for the variables that explicitly concern the latter—Interviewer's Rating of House Type, Lister's Rating of House Type, and Interviewer's Rating of Building Condition—appeared on the matching residence factor. It is interesting that Factor IX only correlated .30 with the most pertinent of the matching residence factors for blacks, Factor I, which was defined by self-reports and ratings.

Factor XI (Power)

Number of officials or politicians he/she has met	.69
Family debts	.33
Republican political party preference	.33
Own occupation—Centers' power	.30
[None]	

The meaning of this factor is not entirely clear, but it appears to concern possession of power in both the political and occupational sense. Factor XI did not correlate ($r = .15$) with the black version of the matching political activity and efficacy factor or match (coefficient = .17) the white counterpart.

Factor XII (Conservative Ideology)

Authoritarianism	.58
Protestant religious preference	.37
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale—revised	.33

Factor XII probably taps basic conservative ideology, despite

the absence of loadings for Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale or Republican Political Party Preference.

Factor XIII (Leadership)

Number of employees supervised	.79
Number of leadership positions in organizations	.32
[None]	

This factor reflects leadership in both occupational and organizational spheres.

Factor XIV (Occupational Orientation)

Congenial vs. economic considerations in choosing a job	.49
Own occupation—Duncan scaling	.34
(Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics)	.45
(Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position)	.39
Interviewer: Age	.32

Factor XIV, the only black one loaded by Own Occupation, involves occupational orientation.

Factor XVI (Class Consciousness)

Believes there are two or more social classes	.60
Thinks of self as being in a social class	.39
Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	-.31

Factor XV clearly measures class consciousness.

Higher Order Factors

Six second-order factors were identified for the white sample and five for the black. The factors, after iteration, accounted for 50.4% of the variance for whites and 44.7% for blacks. The percentages of variance associated with each factor ranged, for whites from 21.9% to 3.4%, and for blacks from 19.3% to 3.6%. Two third-order factors were also identified for each sample, representing, after iteration, 41.0% of the variance for whites and 45.9%

for blacks. The percentages of variance accounted for by each factor was 30.2% and 10.8% for whites and 33.6% and 12.3% for blacks. The second-order as well as the third-order factors were generally difficult to interpret.

CONCLUSIONS

First-Order and Higher Order Factors

In contrast to the relatively clear, though narrow, first-order factors obtained in this study, the higher order ones were not readily interpretable. This outcome is consistent with the Artz et al. (1971) finding that the second-order factors in their investigation were not replicable across communities. The reason for this lack of clarity and stability at the second- and third-order levels is uncertain; these factors might be expected to represent relatively general but perhaps even more meaningful dimensions than the lower order ones, in line with the usual results in the ability and personality domains (Cattell, 1971, 1973). Whatever may cause the higher order factors in this study to take the form that they do, the discussion of the present findings necessarily focuses exclusively on the first-order level.

Clearly the most striking feature of the results was their extraordinary complexity, which was unanticipated on the basis of existing conceptualizations and earlier research. This complexity was reflected in the absence of large general factors as well as in the number of factors obtained, many of which were not congruent with the theories and previous findings or differed in important ways for whites and blacks.

Correspondence of Factors with Conceptualizations

Each of the leading conceptualizations of social stratification received some degree of support from the present factors. In many cases, though, the theoretical dimensions were not precisely verified, and the confirmation did not extend to both samples. Additionally, the extremely wide scope of the obtained factors indicated that even the most elaborate formulations are overly simplistic. These outcomes call into question the utility of current conceptions of stratification and point up the need for an articulated theory that takes into account the extraordinary differentiation existing in this sphere.

Of the three Weberian (Weber, 1946, 1947) dimensions—economic position, social status, and power—the last one was most clearly confirmed in this study. The power component, which involves the possession of political power through organizational action, was directly reflected in the matching organization activity factor. More indirect support for this aspect came from the matching political activity and efficacy as well as the white political efficacy factors. These several factors, though, were not substantially correlated.

The findings for the social status dimension suggest that it is not monolithic, but divided into relatively distinct components. Social status, according to Weber, rests on three bases: life styles, which result in the restriction of social intercourse; education; and prestige of birth or occupation. Support for each of these aspects was apparent in three matching factors: social status, an amalgam of education and life styles; main support's social status, a merger of occupation and education; and residence, an important reflection of life styles (Svalastoga, 1965). Added support stemmed from two other factors—white household expenses and black amount of housing—that are other manifestations of life styles. However, this entire set of factors generally correlated only moderately—the exception being the appreciable correlation for whites between the matching social status and residence factors. Furthermore, some of the life style variables in the study were not included on these factors.

The results confirmed the existence of an economic dimension for whites, despite sparse coverage of the relevant variables, but provided little evidence of it for blacks. This dimension involves three aspects: possession and acquisition of goods, including income from property and securities; life chances; and subjective satisfaction or frustration. Variables from each of these areas were represented in the study, but in a limited way, and very few concern the possession and acquisition component. None of the matching factors bore on this dimension, and all but one of those that were relevant came from the white sample. The pertinent white factors were self-employed, concerning possession and acquisition; occupational success, a combination of subjective satisfaction and life chances; and intactness of family, involving life chances as well as possession and acquisition. These factors, though, were not highly correlated. The solitary black factor was

nature of income, also consisting of life chances together with possession and acquisition.

In Marx's (Marx, 1967; Marx and Engels, 1932) conception, social class is determined by the relationship to means of production, in particular, ownership vs. nonownership of capital and land. This view is congruent with the white self-employed factor, which is loaded by all the variables that clearly bear on this relationship, although none precisely tap it: Own Occupation—Centers' (1949) power, Source of Income, and Current or Last Job: Self-employed vs. Works for Someone Else. However, no factor of this kind was found for blacks.

Centers views social class as a psychological phenomenon, entailing consciousness of membership in a class together with possession of political as well as economic attitudes and behaviors that reflect class feeling and interest. This notion was most clearly confirmed by the black class consciousness factor, which represents class awareness and identification. Centers' conception was also supported to a lesser extent by the white majority group membership factor, which involves political behavior and economic attitudes. It is noteworthy that some highly relevant measures of Centers' construct, especially two variables from his own work—Centers' Class Identification measure and Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale, did not appear on either of these factors and had only minor loadings on the others.

Warner (Warner and Lunt, 1941; Warner et al., 1949) focuses on social status, which he sees as deriving from evaluation by members of the community—the ultimate criterion being participation in social interaction with others at a particular status level coupled with acceptance by them. This conception is consistent with the matching social status factor, which encompasses several variables that carry prestige in this society, including one of the most important: Own Education. In addition, the white version of this factor was loaded by Friend's Occupation, an indicator of social interaction and acceptance, as well as Own Occupation, another central determinant of prestige. However, a few variables that reflect prestige were not included on this factor.

Davis and Moore (Davis and Moore, 1945; Moore, 1963) view several kinds of rewards as reflecting stratification—major ones being sustenance and comfort, self-respect and ego expansion, and humor and diversion; and others consisting of disposable time, and material goods or money. The first two and the last were

clearly confirmed in this investigation. Of the two rewards not supported, humor and diversion was only represented by a single variable—Number of Spare Time Activities, and disposable time was not assessed at all. Sustenance and comfort was reflected by the matching residence, white household expenses, and black amount of housing factors. Self-respect and ego expansion was involved in the matching social status and white occupational success factors. And material goods or money was tapped by two white factors: intactness of family, a merger of income and possessions; and age, which includes savings and home ownership. However, the factors corresponding to a reward correlated only moderately with each other.

Congruence with Previous Factors

The greater complexity of the factor analytic results in the present study than in previous investigations was undoubtedly due to the broader range of variables in this research. Despite important differences between this one and the others in the variables, samples, and procedures involved, all but two of the previously identified factors were found, lending support to the meaning of the current results and indicating that the corresponding factors, at least, have some generality.

Most of this agreement with the previous work involved the five matching factors. Two of them—social status and residence—corresponded to the pair of factors common to all the earlier studies, and a third—main support's social status—agreed with an Artz et al. factor. The consistency is striking with which these three factors were found in the various investigations as well as in both races in this study. In addition, the white majority group membership factor was similar in meaning, despite differences in salient variables, to one that Artz et al. identified.

None of the present factors, however, resembled two others of Artz et al., one tapping father-in-law's as well as wife's social status, and the other reflecting family income. However, the first factor could not have been uncovered in this study, because the variables involved were not in the analysis; and the second, despite being found by Artz et al. in several communities, may be unstable, for nothing of this kind was obtained in any of the earlier investigations, although they included income variables.

Among the present factors that have no counterparts in the earlier research, the most noteworthy are the two other matching

ones—organization activity together with political activity and efficacy. These factors are not only stable, at least in Toledo, having been found in both samples, but also clear cut and potentially important. In particular, they underscore the significance of power, a dimension that has largely been ignored in research on social stratification (Pfautz, 1953). It is not surprising that the two were not identified previously, for the other studies did not include any variables bearing even indirectly on these factors.

Correspondence Between White and Black Factors

Both the similarities as well as the differences between the white and black factors are equally interesting because of the light that they shed on the nature of social stratification in the two races. Only about a quarter of the factors matched, but they included most of the important ones in terms of their correspondence with the conceptualizations and previous studies. Some of the unmatched factors presumably represent substantive differences in the stratification of whites and blacks, mainly reflecting the operation of a variety of social forces on the two races; other unmatched ones, especially those that were not well defined, may simply be unstable and involve sampling error.

Some noteworthy divergences existed even on the matching factors. The failure of Own Occupation and Friend's Occupation to load the social status factor for blacks, although these variables defined the corresponding white one as well as similar factors in previous investigations based predominantly on whites, suggests that occupation has different implications for stratification in the two races. This suggestion is consistent with Glenn's (1963) finding, based on a review of community studies, that occupation is a less important determinant of social status for blacks than whites. One obvious possibility is that the variation in functioning of occupation may be due to the long run impact on blacks of discrimination and segregation.

Incidentally, this line of reasoning about the disjuncture for blacks between occupation and social status is not necessarily contradicted by the presence of Main Support's Occupation on the matching main support's social status factor for both races. This factor, a highly specific one that is limited to the two variables concerning the main support in the analysis—Main Support's Occupation and Main Support's Education, might well split apart for

blacks, akin to what happened to their social status factor, if other variables describing this person were included.

The existence of two residence factors for blacks, one for the census variables and the other for the self-reports and ratings, in contrast to a single white factor encompassing both sets of variables, may stem from the existence in each race of a distinctive frame of reference for evaluating housing, the differential standards being reflected in the self-reports and ratings. The blacks' standards may not be the same as whites' because of differences in the two races' housing experiences, the minority group generally residing in poorer dwellings and residential areas, many blacks living in the very worst homes and sections. Consequently, blacks' evaluations, unlike whites', may diverge sharply from objective indexes of housing quality, such as those provided by the census, resulting in the emergence of separate factors for the minority group.

Some of the factors unique to each sample not only appear to represent important differences in the stratification of whites and blacks, but are also of considerable intrinsic interest in their own right. One is the white self-employed factor, notable theoretically in view of its bearing on Marx's conception of social class. Another is the white majority group membership factor, which has some resemblance to one obtained by Artz et al. Interest in this factor stems primarily from its potential generality. The black class consciousness factor is especially intriguing in view of its theoretical pertinence to Centers' notion of social class. Finally, the black factor that was tentatively interpreted as method variance is also striking, mainly in light of the puzzling absence of a similar one for whites.

Generalizability of Findings

It is important to recognize that this research is a case study of one community at a particular time. The applicability of these findings to other communities and at other times is, of course, an empirical question. The fact that several of the factors were found before indicates that they have some generality; less certainty exists about the others. However, at the very least, all of the factors are likely to be applicable, for the near future, to large northern communities, of which Toledo is representative.

REFERENCE NOTE

1. Rossi, P. H. Personal communications, June 21, 1973.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. A. Regional and racial differences in relations between income and education. *School Review*, 1955, 63, 38-45.
- Artz, R. D., Curtis, R. F., Fairbank, D. T., & Jackson, E. F. Community rank stratification: A factor analysis. *American Sociological Review*, 1971, 36, 985-1002.
- Atherton, K. R. A comparison of solutions obtained in factor analyses of socioeconomic variables. *Psychological Reports*, 1962, 11, 259-273.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. *The American occupational structure*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Blum, Z. D. White and black careers during the first decade of labor force experience. Part II: Income differences. *Social Science Research*, 1972, 1, 271-292.
- Cattell, R. B. *Factor analysis*. New York: Harper, 1952.
- Cattell, R. B. Higher order factor structures and reticular-vs-hierarchical formulae for their interpretation. In C. Banks & P. L. Broadhurst (Eds.), *Stephanos: Studies in psychology presented to Cyril Burt*. London: University of London Press, 1965.
- Cattell, R. B. *Abilities: Their structure, growth, and action*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1971.
- Cattell, R. B. *Personality and mood by questionnaire*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Centers, R. *The psychology of social classes*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1949.
- Chapin, F. S. *Contemporary American institutions*. New York: Harper, 1935.
- Coleman, J. S., Blum, Z. D., Sorenson, A. B., & Rossi, P. H. White and black careers during the first decade of labor force experience. Part I: Occupational status. *Social Science Research*, 1972, 1, 243-270.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1960, 24, 349-354.
- Davis, K., & Moore, W. E. Some principles of stratification. *American Sociological Review*, 1945, 10, 242-249.
- Duncan, O. D. A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In A. J. Reiss, Jr. (Ed.), *Occupations and social status*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.(a)
- Duncan, O. D. Properties and characteristics of the socioeconomic index. In A. J. Reiss, Jr. (Ed.), *Occupations and social status*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.(b)
- Duncan, O. D. Inheritance of poverty or inheritance of race? In D. P. Moynihan (Ed.), *On understanding poverty*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Dwyer, P. S. The determination of the factor loadings of a given test from the known factor loadings of other tests. *Psychometrika*, 1937, 2, 173-178.
- Glenn, N. D. Negro prestige criteria: A case study in the bases of prestige. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1963, 68, 645-657.
- Gordon, M. M. *Social class in American sociology*. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1958.
- Goyder, J. C., & Pineo, P. C. Minority group status and self-evaluated class. *Sociological Quarterly*, 1974, 15, 199-211.
- Guttman, L. A revision of Chapin's Social Status scale. *American Sociological Review*, 1942, 7, 362-369.
- Hendrickson, A. E., & White, P. O. Promax: A quick method for rotation to oblique simple structure. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 1964, 17, 65-70.
- Hollingshead, A. B. *Two factor index of social position*. New Haven, Conn.: Author, 1957.
- Jackman, M. R., & Jackman, R. W. An interpretation of the relation between objective and subjective social status. *American Sociological Review*, 1973, 38, 569-582.

- Kahl, J. A., & Davis, J. A. A comparison of indexes of socio-economic status. *American Sociological Review*, 1955, 20, 317-325.
- Knupfer, G. *Indices of socio-economic status: A study of some problems of measurement*. New York: Author, 1946.
- Laumann, E. O. *Prestige and association in an urban community*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.
- Lenski, G. E. Status crystallization: A non-vertical dimension of social status. *American Sociological Review*, 1954, 19, 405-413.
- Marx, K. *Capital*. (Vol. 3). *The process of capitalist production as a whole*. New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. New York: International Publishers, 1932.
- McNemar, Q. On the number of factors. *Psychometrika*, 1942, 7, 9-18.
- Moore, W. E. But some are more equal than others. *American Sociological Review*, 1963, 28, 13-18.
- Park, R. E. The bases of race prejudice. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1928, 140(229), 11-20.
- Pfautz, H. W. The current literature on social stratification: Critique and bibliography. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1953, 58, 391-418.
- Stricker, L. J. *Dimensions of social stratification for whites and blacks: The Toledo Study*. (ETS RB 76-30). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 143734).
- Stricker, L. J. "SES" indexes: What do they measure? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 1980, 1, 93-101.
- Svalastoga, K. *Social differentiation*. New York: McKay, 1965.
- Turner, R. H. Negro job status and education. *Social Forces*, 1953, 32, 45-52.
- U. S. Bureau of the Budget. *Standard metropolitan statistical areas*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. censuses of population and housing: 1960. Census tracts*. (Final Report PHC(1)-158). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of housing: 1970. General housing characteristics*. (Final Report HC(1)-A37 Ohio). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of population and housing: 1970. Census tracts*. (Final Report PHC(1)-215 Toledo, Ohio-Michigan SMSA). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Warner, W. L. American caste and class. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1936, 42, 234-237.
- Warner, W. L., & Low, J. O. *The social system of the modern factory*. (Yankee City Series, Vol. 4). New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1947.
- Warner, W. L., & Lunt, P. S. *The social life of a modern community*. (Yankee City Series, Vol. 1). New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1941.
- Warner, W. L., & Lunt, P. S. *The status system of a modern community*. (Yankee City Series, Vol. 2). New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1942.
- Warner, W. L., Meeker, M., & Eells, K. *Social class in America*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.
- Warner, W. L., & Srole, L. *The social systems of American ethnic groups*. (Yankee City Series, Vol. 3). New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1945.
- Weber, M. Class, status, party. In H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Weber, M. *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.